

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed on December 4, 2008, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 3, and 14 have been amended to incorporate allowable features from claim 20 which have been identified in the Office Action and to provide antecedent basis in claim 3 for amended claim 1. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, 12-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maynard (US 6,175,830) and Douglass et al. (US 2002/0040311, hereinafter "Douglass") and further in view of Liddy et al. (US 6,006,221, hereinafter "Liddy"). Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Maynard, Douglass, and Liddy in view of Kadayam et al. (US 2003/0212673, hereinafter "Kadayam"). Claims 20-28 are allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

1, 2, 6-9, and 12-19

Claims 1, 2, 6-9, and 12-19 are rejected as being unpatentable over Maynard and Douglass in view of Liddy. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

In the Office Action, independent claim 20 is identified as being allowable over the currently cited references of record (i.e., Maynard, Douglass, Liddy, and Kadayam) based on the Applicant's arguments on page 12 (last paragraph) which were made in the response filed on September 25, 2008 and which were found to be persuasive by the Examiner. In the aforementioned response, the Applicants argued that claim 20 is patentably distinguishable from the combination of cited references (including Maynard and Douglass) because the claim specifies an on-object user interface which generates a menu (in response to receiving a pointing

action) for removing the tag in the on-object user interface. In contrast, the display of search results and the categorical tag discussed in Maynard and Douglass fails to disclose an on-object user interface for removing a tag. As conceded by the Examiner in the allowance of independent claim 20, Liddy (which discusses a document retrieval system where a user can enter a query, including a natural language query, in a desired one of a plurality of supported languages, and retrieve documents from a database that includes documents in at least one other language of the plurality of supported languages – see Abstract) also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the aforementioned features.

In view of the above, independent claims 1 and 14 have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter identified in the Office Action. In particular, the claims have been amended to specify removing a tag from a displayed item associated with the one or more search results by specifying in the user interface that the item should not be categorized, wherein the user interface comprises an on-object-user interface which receives a pointing action from a computer pointing device for pointing at the displayed item, the pointing action causing the generation of a menu for removing the tag in the on-object user interface.

Based on the foregoing, amended claims 1 and 14 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn. Claims 2, 6-9, 12-13, and 15-19 depend from amended claims 1 and 14, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5

Claims 3-5 are rejected being unpatentable over Maynard, Douglass, and Liddy in view of Kadayam. The rejection of these claims is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3-5 depend from amended claim 1 and thus specify at least the same features. As discussed above, amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references of record (i.e., Maynard, Douglass, Liddy, and Kadayam) for specifying at least removing a tag from a displayed item associated with the one or more search results by specifying in the user interface that the item should not be categorized, wherein the user interface comprises an on-object-user interface which receives a pointing action from a computer pointing device for pointing at the displayed item, the pointing action causing the generation of a menu for removing the tag in the on-object user interface. Therefore, claims 3-5, which depend from amended claim 1, are allowable over the cited references of record for at least the same reasons. Thus, claims 3-5 are allowable and the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: March 4, 2009

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III
Reg. No. 47,299

